

24 June 81

E.M.

OK

If E.O. 12065 is amended sufficiently to permit Agency heads to decide terms of classification review, the DCI should empower OIS/CRO to serve as coordinator for establishing guides for selective retention of records. These (records) would be items having continuing value - historical or other intrinsic value to warrant continued preservation.

1. The classification review procedure could be flexible and allow for review and classification of special projects by blocks of information.

Types

2. Non textual records could be reviewed by box or bulk methods with appropriate labels indicating classification restrictions such as copyright, release restrictions, etc..

Who's

3. Certain offices' documents such as FDD publication seem to lend ^{consideration} toward standard or routine blanket classification ^{for} retention or downgrading.

Extend
Support

In addition to ongoing support to NARS and State, Possible visits to DOD facilities would be beneficial. Specifically, a tour or briefing by the DOD historical office would be beneficial.

1987-
2000

A check of the impact that CRD has made on the linear feet of material in the timeframe 1979-81 would be one means of determining future projections.

Electronic/
GDP.

Consultation with specialists in order to determine how these permanent records are stored, their recall requirements and historical value, would be required.

Stan,

✓ (2.) Thoughts on future policy for systematic review. Would like to have when return on 5 October. Contributions welcome from all.

1. Exempt review of DDO material, since a great majority of their files will not be declassified.
2. Exempt review of Compartmented material.
3. Do not review Chrono files, because record copy documents are usually filed in either Subject or Project files.
4. To ensure protection of CIA's interest in Agency and other Agencies' documents stored at NARS and WNRC, CRD personnel should continue the classification review of these documents.
5. CRD should continue to review FRUS, manuscripts, ^(AGENCY & DOD) speeches, newspaper articles and mandatory FOIA and PA requests.

[Redacted Box]

9-24-81

STAT

Virtually all DDO, DDS&T and DDI documents require sanitization
✓ to avoid revealing sources and methods. Therefore, they can be
downgraded at most. This does not make them available to researchers,
so systematic review (which does not allow for sanitization) serves
no purpose and should be eliminated.

✓ FBIS report should be regularly declassified and made available
to the public, as should NFAC studies which do not reveal sources
and methods. ~~of~~ CAPABILITIES.

Not systematically
Records of the O/DCI should be reviewed. ~~since~~ They may contain
documents dealing with policy matters that will be of historical
✓ interest but will not deal with sources and methods, etc. There
won't be many, however. *They should be subject to mandatory
review only.*

State and DOD will undoubtedly continue some sort of systematic
review. We should continue to use CRD (preferably annuitants) to
work with Archives.

✓ CRD should continue to work with State on the FRUS. Suggest
one NFAC and one DO detailee or annuitant work full time with
CRD-
State on this. Eliminate separate DO review, but have one DO officer
with authority to go directly to area division or country desk to
check on any matters which may be questionable and which may require
current knowledge about country in question. Referent would coordinate
with IMS, of course, but would be able to deal personally with
area officers. In other words, CRD would be responsible for
protection of sources, methods, requirements, etc. and would show
to country desk only those documents which might involve current
political sensitivities, liaison relations, etc. CRD would have
to be very careful in its review, but it would avoid a lot of
needless duplication of effort since only a ~~very~~ few documents
would be involved.